

**To:** Kraker, Dan[dkraker@mpr.org]; Dunbar, Elizabeth[edunbar@mpr.org]  
**Cc:** Karen Diver[KarenDiver@FDLREZ.COM]; Sean Copeland[SeanCopeland@FDLREZ.COM]; Rebecca J. St George[RebeccaStGeorge@FDLREZ.COM]; John Pastor[jpastor@d.umn.edu]; Wagener, Christine[wagener.christine@epa.gov]; Pfeifer, David[pfeifer.david@epa.gov]; Hyde, Tinka[hyde.tinka@epa.gov]  
**From:** Nancy Schuldt  
**Sent:** Wed 3/25/2015 2:25:21 PM  
**Subject:** RE: sulfate standard

Dan, Elizabeth:

I appreciate MPR seeking a tribal response to MPCA's announcement, but unfortunately many of us were in a consultation meeting with EPA all day Tuesday regarding the Great Lakes Legacy Act cleanup of the US Steel Superfund site in Duluth. Ironical.

I think it is premature for me to speak publicly about my take on MPCA's approach. Minnesota tribal staff have been in consultation with MPCA for the past 4 years or so on the wild rice standards update, and we were supposed to have the 'courtesy', at least, of a meeting with MPCA before the public release of their proposed approach, on Thursday. For whatever reason (Dayton's statement? Media frenzy?), MPCA decided they needed to make their announcement a couple days early. Until I have personally had a chance to hear from MPCA staff about the details of their proposal, and ask the specific questions I have, I am not comfortable making a statement.

For what it's worth, I believe Dr. Pastor's reaction is well justified. He is one of the most well-respected, widely published research ecologists in North America, and his involvement in the research program gave me great hope that high quality experimental science would provide the underpinnings for any updated wild rice water quality standards. Yet the agency chose not to take advantage of his insights and significant expertise in statistical analysis; the university researchers were all cut loose after providing their final data reports. MPCA was not interested in their own contracted researchers' analysis or interpretation of the data they collected; this is puzzling on multiple levels. Moreover, they focused on *one* of the peer reviewer's recommendations (the 'sophisticated' statistical analysis that yielded this magic equation), and even contracted with him to conduct it, but they did not follow through with another peer reviewer's recommendation – that they more clearly investigate the effects of sulfate loading/sulfide toxicity on wild rice *at the population level*. This corresponds with one of the very specific recommendations that tribal staff provided to MPCA from the beginning of our consultation with them on how best to protect a culturally significant, diminishing subsistence resource. We urged MPCA to take every step possible within their Clean Water Act regulatory authorities to protect *all* remaining stands of manoomin, not some arbitrary density or unrealistically constant occurrence. Wild rice is under assault from all sides, with climate

change impacts thrown on top; we can't afford to sacrifice any more of what remains.

This is important background for any further reporting that MPR does as the rulemaking process unfolds. It is so offensive to see Iron Range legislators' opinions (after a concerted, year-long misinformation campaign from industry) presented on the same footing as the research scientists who did their best to provide the right information to MPCA to support a scientifically defensible rule.

Nancy Schuldt

Water Projects Coordinator

Fond du Lac Environmental Program

1720 Big Lake Road

Cloquet, MN 55720

218.878.7110 ph

218.878.7168 fax